EVENT VIOLATION INSPECTOR'S STATEMENT MINERALS REGULATORYPROGAM

Company/Mine: Witt Excavating Sandstone Quarry CO # MC-05-01-01(1) Permit #: M/051/006 Violation # 1 of 1

SER

4.

| SERIOUSN. | ESS |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1. | What type of event is applicable to the regulation cited? Refer to the DOGM reference list of event below and remember that the event is NOT the same as the violation. Mark and explain each event. |
| | a. Activity outside the approved permit area. b. Injury to the public (public safety). c. Damage to property. d. Conducting activities without appropriate approvals. e. Environmental harm. f. Water pollution. g. Loss of reclamation/revegetation potential. h. Reduced establishment, diverse and effective vegetative cover. i. No event occurred as a result of the violation. j. Other. |
| Explanation: in the 1950's | Operator was not aware a permit was needed from DOGM - this quarry was started based on an agreement between the landowner and the operator. |
| 2. | Has the event or damage occurred? <u>yes</u> If yes, describe it. If no, what would cause it to occur and what is the probability of the event(s) occurring? (None, Unlikely, Likely). |
| Explanation: | Evidence of recent mining related activity was observed at the site. |

Did any damage occur as a result of the violation? Unlikely 3.

> If yes, describe the duration and extent of the damage or impact. How much damage may have occurred if the violation had not bee discovered by a DOGM inspector? Describe this potential damage and whether or not it would extend off the disturbed and/or permit area.

Explanation: Activities appeared to have been contained within the historic footprint of this quarry. No evidence of impacts off-site were observed.

| B. DEG | REE OF FAULT (Check the statements which apply to the violation and discuss). |
|------------------------------|--|
| | Was the violation not the fault of the operator (due to vandalism or an act of God), explain. Remember that the permittee is considered responsible for the actions of all persons working on the mine site. |
| Explanation: | |
| | Was the violation the result of not knowing about DOGM regulations, indifference to DOGM regulations or the result of lack of reasonable care. |
| was made pre needed. This | Recent activity was conducted as per agreement of landowner and operator that e-law (1950's) Neither operator or landowner was aware that a mining permit was quarry is only operated intermittantly, with minimal material being removed at any tal historic disturbance is estimated at about 1.5 acres. |
| | If the actual or potential environmental harm or harm to the public should have been evident to a careful operator, describe the situation and what, if anything, the operator did to correct it prior to being cited. |
| Explanation: | |
| | Was the operator in violation of a specific permit condition? |
| Explanation: | |
| | Has DOGM cited the violation in the past? If so, give the dates and the type of warning or enforcement action taken. |
| Explanation: | |
| W | as any economic benefit gained by the operator for failure to comply? |
| If | yes explain. |
| Explanation: | |

GOOD FAITH

1. In order to receive good faith for compliance with an NOV or CO, the violation must have been abated before the abatement deadline. If you think this applies, describe how rapid compliance was achieved (give date) and describe the measures the operator took to comply as rapidly as possible.

Explanation: <u>Land owner called the next day to discuss the violation.</u> The operator called the next day to make arrangements for filing an SMO. the SMO was submitted within a week, including the reclamation surety. Once they were aware of the need to have a permit, compliance was achieved very expiditiously.

2. Explain whether or not the operator had the necessary resources on site to achieve compliance.

Explanation: Operator obtained the necessary forms for permitting from the Division's web site.

3. Was the submission of plans prior to physical activity required by this NOV / CO? No If yes, explain.

Explanation:

Lynn Kunzler

7-//

February 24, 2005

Authorized Representative

Signature

Date

O:\M051-Wasatch\S0510006-witt\non-compliance\ins-stat-mc050101-1.doc